



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In chaps. ix and x Clark sums up his results, which are on the whole most astonishing. Not only does he find that all these MSS go back to an ancestor or ancestors having 10 to 12 letters to the line and that almost numberless text variants are due to the careless omission of such lines in copying, but he also attacks the great interpolations so called (Matt. 16:2-3; 20:2; John 5:4; 7:53-8:11; Luke 5:14; 22:19-20; 22:43-44; Mark 16:9-20) showing that all have a length of approximately 160 letters or multiples of that number. They are therefore best explained as omissions of columns or series of columns in the common ancestors of those families of MSS omitting the passages.

Omissions because of homoeoteleuton are frequent in the New Testament text and recent editors often resort to that explanation of variants. That other variants are due to the careless omission of single lines or groups of lines by copyists is equally well known to New Testament scholars. Not only, therefore, is there much that is not new in Professor Clark's method, but one instinctively feels that more is not true. And yet such a dismissal of this interesting study would be most unjust. To be sure, the failure to consider New Testament criticism in its entirety and especially the influence of parallels in the different Gospels vitiates the result as a whole. The logical result of such a study would be to accept the longest text as original, an assumption certainly not more unreasonable than Hort's preference for the shorter text; but the truth probably lies between the two. Clark's criticism of Hort (p. 55) is deserved and timely, and the emphasis he has thrown on the possibility of omissions in the early MSS cannot fail to be helpful to New Testament scholars; but any such wholesale acceptance or rejection of doubtful passages can never be convincing.

A similar study of the text of the Acts with equally startling discoveries is given in chaps. xi and xii, while in chap. xiii results are summarized and new and even sharper criticisms given of the adoption and defense of the "Shorter Text" by Hort and his school.

HENRY A. SANDERS

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque. By A. MEILLET. Paris; Librairie Hachette et Cie, 1913. Fr. 3.50.

If notice of this book has been too long delayed and no extended review will now be attempted, it is from no lack of appreciation of its unique value. I know of no such clear, competent, and really interesting account of the history of the Greek language along broad lines. The author describes briefly the special characteristics of Greek in its relation to the other Indo-European languages, and considers the question of its indebtedness to the pre-Hellenic languages which it displaced. This he believes to be very considerable in vocabulary, though in our ignorance of these languages it is only

rarely that specific evidence of borrowing is available. But the main emphasis of the book is upon the internal development of Greek from the earliest times to the present day, especially the evolution of the literary and standardized forms. The historical and linguistic background of the various literary types is described with exceptional fullness and in a manner which will appeal to the interest of all Greek scholars, even those who are repelled by linguistic discussions of a different character.

C. D. B.

Commentationes Philologae Ienenses ediderunt Seminarii Philologorum Ienensis Professores. Voluminis decimi fasciculus primus.

CAROLUS BARWICK: *De Platonis Phaedri temporibus.* Leipzig: Teubner, 1913. Pp. 76. M. 3.20.

Some scholars have dated the *Phaedrus* very early, even before the death of Socrates, others about the time of the *Gorgias* and the *Meno*, and others presumably after the *Republic*. In *The Unity of Plato's Thought*, p. 71, I date it conjecturally *ca.* 379 on the general ground of the maturity and richness of the thought and the evidence of *Sprachstatistik*, and the particular ground of the parody of Isocrates' *Panegy.* 8 in 267A. Dr. Barwick dates it after the *Gorgias*, *Euthyphro*, and *Meno* and before the *Euthydemus*, *Cratylus*, *Phaedo*, and *Symposium*. His argument rests mainly on alleged contradictions or developments of the thought of other dialogues which he finds in it, and on the evolution of Plato's psychology. This is the method against which I have always protested, and I need not repeat my arguments here. The chief assumptions or at any rate implications of this method seem to be (1) that Plato's mind possessed no general stock of favorite notions and fixed convictions to which he might refer at any time; (2) that casual allusion to an idea elsewhere more fully developed warrants the inference that the more explicit exposition is the earlier; (3) that we may safely treat variations of expression as contradictions in thought without first trying to explain them by literary or stylistic motives. These postulates seem to me improbable both on a priori grounds and in their special application to Plato. It would hardly seem to me a parody of this method to argue that Aristophanes' *Wasps* must be earlier than any comedy that touches on its main *motif*, than for example the jest in *Clouds* 207: οὐ πείθομαι ἐπὶ δικαστῶς οὐχ ὁρῶ καθημένους. or than *Acharnians* 376, *Knights* 1316-17. In fact, of course, neither these allusions nor those in *Pax* 505 and *Aves* 40 prove anything except that the idea was in Aristophanes' mind.

In the last two chapters Barwick endeavors to meet the objections of *Sprachstatistik*. The *Republic* has, according to Ianell's tables, 35.27 hiatuses to a page, the *Phaedrus* 23.90, the *Philebus* 3.70. This, Barwick argues, does not justify grouping the *Phaedrus* with the *Philebus* and the other late dialogues in which hiatus was consciously and systematically